



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Appl. No.

10/075,857

(Confirmation No. 9430)

JAN 1 4 2004

Applicants

Kenneth Fred Bailey February 14, 2002

Filed Art Unit

3652

Examiner

Raymond B. Johnson

Date: January 14, 2004

Docket No. Customer No.: 4148.4 21176

Commissioner for Patents Post Office Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO THE RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

This responds to the Office Action mailed December 15, 2003, in which the Examiner asks that Applicants elect one of the two inventions, namely Invention I and Invention II. According to the Examiner, Invention I includes Claims 1-41 and 47-60, drawn to a diffuser apparatus, and Invention II includes Claims 42-46 and 61-75, drawn to a method of distributing particulate material.

Applicants elect without traverse to prosecute Claims 1-41 and 47-60 (i.e., Invention I). Applicants expressly reserve the right to file a divisional application or take other measures necessary to protect non-elected Claims 42-46 and 61-75 (i.e., Invention II).

The Examiner has indicated that upon electing Invention I, Applicants should further elect for prosecution one of three species, which the Examiner describes as species A (Figures 1-5), species B (Figure 6), and species C (Figures 7-9). Applicants, however, respectfully assert that this sub-restriction is unfounded and request that the Examiner reconsider the same.



Serial No.: 10/075,857 Filed: February 14, 2002 Response of January 14, 2004

Page 2 of 3

First, please note that Figure 9 of species C is a photograph of wood chips that have been stacked using a chip diffuser according to the present invention. Applicants assert that Figure 9 has erroneously been categorized in species C and respectfully request that Figure 9 of species C be withdrawn from the sub-restriction requirement.

Second, Applicants traverse the Examiner's sub-restriction requirement with respect to species B. According to MPEP § 806.04(e-f) "claims to be restricted to different species must recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species." Applicants respectfully submit that species B is not mutually exclusive with species A as depicted in Figures 1-4 or with species C as depicted in Figures 7-8.

In this regard, please note that Figure 5 of species A and Figure 6 of species B depict different modes of mounting the vanes (21) onto the vane mounting rods (13). Either of these modes of mounting the vanes on the vane mounting rods can be employed in various embodiments of the claimed invention. See Paragraph 58.

For instance, the vanes illustrated in Figures 1-4 of species A can be mounted on vane mounting rods as depicted either in Figure 5 of species A or in Figure 6 of species B. Likewise, the vanes illustrated in Figures 7-8 of species C can be mounted on vane mounting rods as depicted either in Figure 5 of species A or in Figure 6 of species B. Applicants respectfully contend that species B is not mutually exclusive either with species A as shown in Figures 1-4 or with species C as shown in Figures 7-8. In view of the foregoing, Applicants request the Examiner withdraw the sub-restriction requirement with respect to species B.

Third, Applicants turn to Examiner's sub-restriction requirement with respect to species C. Applicants note that Figures 1-6 depict non-curved toe bars (25) and Figures 7-8 depict curved toe bars (25). It appears to Applicants that the Examiner is indicating that species A and species C have mutually exclusive toe bar designs. For that reason, Applicants hereby elect with traverse to prosecute species C, which depicts curved toe bars. Applicants believe that pending Claims 1-41 and 47-60 appear to be pertinent to the elected species C.



Serial No.: 10/075,857 Filed: February 14, 2002 Response of January 14, 2004

Page 3 of 3

That said, Applicants traverse the sub-restriction requirement. Applicants contend that the combined examination of claims directed to a chip diffuser having curved toe bars and a chip diffuser having non-curved toe bars will not be unduly burdensome. See MPEP § 803 ("There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required."). In this regard, MPEP § 808.02 states "[w]here, however, the classification is the same and the field of search is the same and there is no clear indication of separate future classification and field of search, no reasons exist for dividing among related inventions." In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the sub-restriction requirement.

If Applicants have misinterpreted the Examiner's intentions with respect to the sub-restriction requirement, please contact the undersigned attorney at (704) 945-6702.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Additon

Registration No. 43,460

021176

Summa & Allan, P.A. 11610 North Community House Road Suite 200 Charlotte, NC 28277-2162 Telephone: 704-945-6700

Facsimile: 704-945-6735

S:\FJRM DOCS\4148\4P\Election011404.doc



RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 1 4 2004

11610 NORTH COMMUNITY HOUSE RIA SUITE 200

BALLANTYNB CORPORATE PARK CHARLOTTE, NC 28277

T; 704.945.5700

TO: USPTO

704.945.6735

MODAMMARQWWYQ :



TO: Examinet: Raymond B. Johnson Art Unit 3652 COMPANY: USPTO	FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET	
USPTO 1/14/2004 FAX NUMBER: TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER: 703-872-9306 5 PHONE NUMBER: SENDER'S REPRRENCE NUMBER: 4148.4 RE: YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER: YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER: Confirmation No.: 9430	Examiner: Raymond B. Johnson	
703-872-9306 5 PHONE NUMBER: SENDER'S REPREDICE NUMBER: 703-308-2565 4148.4 RV:: YOUR REPERENCE NUMBER: YOUR YOUR YOUR YOUR YOUR YOUR YOUR YOUR		1/14/2004
703-308-2565 4148.4 YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER: Set. No.: 10/075,857 Filed: February 14, 2002 Confirmation No.: 9430		
Set. No.: 10/075,857 Filed: February 14, 2002 Confirmation No.: 9430		
D DE LASE RECYCLE	Set. No.: 10/075,857 Filed: February 14, 2002	YOUR REPERENCE NUMBER:
LI ORGENT. LI FOR REVIEW LI PLEASE COMMENT. LI PLEASE REPLI LI PLEASE REVIEW.	□ URGENT □ FOR REVIEW □ F	LEASE COMMENT PLEASE REPLY PLEASE RECYCLE

Please find attached a Response to the Restriction Requirement in the above-referenced patent application.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The information commined in this facsimile message is legally privileged and confidential. It is intended only for the use of the above-named individual or entity. If you are the reader of this message and are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this facsimile is strictly probabited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by phone and return the original message to us at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.



TO: USPTO

PTO/SB/97 (08-03) Approved for use through 07/31/2008, OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Palent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons am required to respond to a collection of information unlocs it contains a valid OMB control number.

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. 703-872-9306 on January 14, 2004 Date Vinishertas Vinisha Joshi Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

This certificate of transmission is for the Response to Restriction Requirement being submitted in the Patent Application Ser. No. 10/075,857, filed February 14, 2002

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or minin a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentially is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.8 minutes to complete, including gethering, proparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be cont to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS, SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

if you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.